

match with addresses associated with resource indications. Rather, the system of the Kanazawa patent operates in a different manner from that recited in the claims.

Specifically, in the system of the Kanazawa patent, when DVD content is being displayed that has a corresponding web page, a notice is displayed on the screen, in the form of the Web button, to inform the user of the existence of that web page. To retrieve the web page, the system responds to a command from the user, i.e. pressing of the Web button. Upon receiving that command, the system determines whether a URL is present in data provided by the DVD. If it finds a URL in that data, it retrieves the web page at the indicated location.

This procedure does not involve examining *addresses of requested DVD data*. Instead, it is a passive operation in which the system awaits a *command* from the user, in the form of a button press. Furthermore, when the command is received, the system does not operate to detect a match with *addresses* associated with resource indications. At most, it checks to see whether a URL, i.e. a resource indication itself, is present in certain data from the DVD. The patent does not disclose that any type of *matching* procedure is performed. More importantly, it does not describe any sort of operation that is directed to *addresses* associated with resource indications, distinct from the URLs themselves.

For at least these reasons, therefore, the Kanazawa patent does not anticipate the subject matter of claim 2, since it fails to disclose *every* element recited in the claim. Responding to a command manually entered by a user is not the same as examining addresses in requested DVD data.

For at least these same reasons, the patent cannot be interpreted to anticipate claims 12, 21 or 29, or any of their dependent claims.

Claim 10 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 on the basis of the Kanazawa patent, on the grounds that it would be obvious to utilize sectors to store data on a disk record medium. Even if this premise is accepted, however, it is respectfully submitted that the Kanazawa patent does not suggest the claimed subject matter, for the reasons presented above.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the Office Action dated August 25, 2005, has not made the necessary showing to support a rejection that the subject

matter of the rejected claims is anticipated by the Kanazawa patent. Withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL, PC

Date: November 25, 2005

By: 

James A. LaBarre

Registration No. 28,632

P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1404
(703) 836-6620